



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS

Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre. Von Friedrich Stolz. Müller's Handbuch, zweiter Band, zweite Abteilung. Vierte Auflage. München: Beck (1910).

In this new edition of the Stolz-Schmalz grammar, Stolz's account of the sounds and forms has increased from the 193 pages of the edition of 1900 to a total of 302 pages. Almost every paragraph in the book shows modifications and additions, and many have been entirely rewritten (e.g. the sections on ablaut, pp. 55-60, and on vowel weakening in compounds, pp. 68-71). Several new topics have been introduced, such as linguistic method (pp. 12 f.), the sounds of the Indo-European parent speech (pp. 22 ff.), and syllable division (p. 39).

The author has succeeded, in spite of the additional material, in making his treatment much clearer than before. This has been accomplished largely by breaking up long paragraphs which contained a number of coordinate details. The new arrangement enables the reader to see at a glance where the logical divisions of the subject matter fall, and at the same time makes it far easier to pick out any one item upon which information is wanted. The phrasing, too, of many passages has been put into a more lucid form; for example, the puzzling statement (p. 119 of the third edition), that all nouns except *o-* and *a-* stems form the nom. pl. masc. and fem. with the suffix *-ēs* = I-E. *-ēs*, has been so modified (pp. 191 f. of the fourth edition) as to bring into proper relief the contrast existing between I-E. *-es* and the various Latin innovations.

The plan of the book remains unchanged except for the omission of a few sections and the addition of a few new ones. The author retains even his arbitrary distribution of the vowel changes into a number of categories that have no recognizable relation to the vowel system of either Indo-European or Latin. Why, for instance, should *sinciput* from **sēmi-caput* or *imber* from **mbhri* be treated under the caption, "I-E. *e* = Lat. *i*?" And why should that topic be included in a section on (Latin) *e*?

Aside from points of style, there are very few changes in the entire book that can be traced to the author's own study of his subject. The improvements nearly all come from Brugmann's *Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik*, the second edition of Vol. 2, Part 1 of the *Grundriss*, Sommer's *Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, and Walde's *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Stolz could not have chosen better guides, and he displays abundant good sense in refusing to follow them when their attempts to blaze new paths prove unsuccessful. The result is a book upon which students in related fields may generally rely with some confidence, although specialists in grammar will rarely turn to it except for one purpose.

As in the former editions, the references to the literature are very full. There are, as was inevitable, occasional omissions. Bennett's *Latin Language* is nowhere mentioned, although the Appendix finds a place in the list of bibliographical abbreviations. Solmsen's theory (*Beiträge zur Griechischen Wortforschung* 179) that *mox* was originally a nom. sing. should have been mentioned on page 155 or page 175. The reviewer's monograph on *Contraction in the Case Forms of the Latin io- and iā- Stems and of deus, is, and idem* might have been consulted with profit. For example, the demonstration there offered (pp. 5 f.) that *-iē* from *-iei* did not contract in the time of Plautus and Terence might have prevented the grotesque statement on page 194 that in the *io-* stems the earlier language preferred the contracted forms of the nom. pl., such as *fili*, or the one on page 216 that *mi* is a contraction of *mihi* (for Plautus pronounced *mihē*).

Even the literature to which the author refers has not been fully assimilated, excepting always the works of Brugmann, Sommer, and Walde. An illuminating example of his method of dealing with other scholars occurs on page 56. The *Anmerkung* which was inserted in the third edition, to the effect that "the view expressed in the two previous editions with respect to Plautine scansion like *deus* has been completely disproved by Skutsch (*Satura Viadrina* 122 f.)," is reprinted word for word (even to the phrase "in the two previous editions"!), with the addition of "Cf . . . most recently on synizesis in Latin in general Radford, *Class. Phil.* 3.153 ff.". Now Radford's paper is not on "synizesis in Latin in general", but contains merely certain addenda to his longer and more important article on Plautine Synizesis, *TAPA*, 36.158-210. The two papers together constitute an elaborate defense of the traditional theory of synizesis in the early Latin dramatists, in opposition to C. F. W. Müller, Skutsch, and Havet, who consistently scan *mēō* and *ēō* as well as *bōnō* and *āmō*, according to the iambic law, in all cases where the verse requires those words to contain only two morae. The subject is of first rate importance, and one upon which Classical scholars have a right to expect light from a linguistic specialist. Stolz is surely correct in following Skutsch (see the delightful ridicule which Exon heaps upon the orthodox view in *Hermathena* 36.121-143); but it was his duty to digest all the literature on the topic (Skutsch's article in *Épax* pp. 108 ff., and Radford's longer paper are not even mentioned) and to give us a mature opinion upon the question—even though Brugmann, Sommer and Walde have not yet spoken.

In the new edition, as in its predecessors, Stolz's work is convenient and fairly reliable for all points that have passed the controversial stage, but it cannot be even remotely compared with Brugmann's companion volume on Greek grammar.

BARNARD COLLEGE.

E. H. STURTEVANT.